MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 August, 1974

AM
10:00 *CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.*

ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: 18 September, 1974
16 October, 1974

Remaining 1974 meetings: 20 November, 1974
18 December, 1974

B. Minutes of June 1974 meeting.

C. Preliminary Budget Estimates, Fiscal Year 1976.

D. Ratification of Commission of Fine Arts Charter, as (may be) required by Public Law 92-463, 86 Stat. 770.

SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

10:45 *A. Federal Home Loan Bank Board and General Services Administration*

Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building, 17th & G Streets, N.W., Revised Designs including Retention of 610 17th Street, N.W.

11:15 *B. Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park*

Preliminary Plans for Remodelling Elephant House Yards and Bird House Hill Development - Revised Designs.

11:30 *C. National Park Service, National Capital Parks*

1. Fort Circle Park Shelters for Fort Totten, Fort Dupont, and Fort Stanton - Preliminary Designs.

2. Anacostia Park Master Plan - Revised Designs

3. Anacostia Park Roller Skating Pavillion - Preliminary Design.

4. Bus Shelter for 7th Street, National Gallery, West End - Preliminary Design.

11:45 D. *Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers*

Army Band Building, Fort Myer - Preliminary Design.

11:55 E. *Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint*

U.S. Customs Service Seal Medal - Proposed Design.

12:00 F. *D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development*

Shipstead-Luce Act

1. SL 75-7, 1724 Portal Drive, N.W., New Private Residence.

2. SL 75-8, 25 Louisiana Avenue, N.W., New Nine Story Office Building for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters - AFL-CIO.

3. Appendix 1.

Old Georgetown Act

Appendix 2.

12:30 G. *Redevelopment Land Agency*

1. Glasgow Seafood Restaurant, Site 2-A of C Deck, Southwest Waterfront - Preliminary Design.

2. International Trade Center, Metro Center, 12th & G Streets, N.W. - Preliminary Design.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
14 August, 1974

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Members Present:	*Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman* *Hon. Kevin Roche* *Hon. Chloethiel Woodard Smith* *Hon. George A. Weymouth*
Staff Present:	*Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary* *Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary* *Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson* *Miss Nancy Ferguson* *Mr. J. L. Sibley Jennings, Jr.* *Mrs. Sue A. Kohler* *Mrs. Nancy N. Lusher* *Mr. David L. Miller*
National Capital Planning Commission Staff Present:	*Mr. David Smith*
Others Present:	*Mr. John Gallinger, U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel* *Ms. Sarah Booth Conroy, Washington Post*

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings: 18 September, 1974; at the request of the Chairman and Mr. Roche the meeting was set for 9:15 a.m., in place of the usual 10:00 a.m. starting time. The following meeting was scheduled for 16 October, 1974. The remaining 1974 meetings would normally fall on 20 November and 18 December.

B. Minutes of the June 1974 meeting were approved without alteration.

C. Preliminary Budget Estimates for Fiscal Year 1976. As required by law, the Commission of Fine Arts budget was discussed in Executive Session, pending presentation of the estimates to the President and Congress. The Secretary told the Members that no new major expenses were anticipated, and that a general escalation of all costs of 5% was expected across the board. No new staff positions were anticipated, but an increase in printing expenses from $11,000 to $21,000 was foreseen in order to

handle the expected Massachusetts Avenue Architecture, Volume II, an updated history of the Commission of Fine Arts including sections on the Georgetown and Shipstead-Luce Acts, and an Annual Report of the Commission of Fine Arts covering fiscal 1972, -3, and -4. The total estimated budget as approved by the Commission was $196,000.

D. Ratification of the Commission of Fine Arts Charter, as may be required by Public Law 92-463, 86 Stat. 770. The Secretary told the Commission of efforts to determine the applicability of this law intended to give public access to deliberations, decisions, and reports of advisory committees of the Federal Government. He described his discussions with the Department of Justice and the Office of Management and Budget to determine if the Commission did indeed fall within the purvue of this new law. Part of the requirement of this law was a charter to be filed with the Office of Management and Budget outlining the Commission's authorization and operation. A draft had been filed with the OMB and was officially approved by the Members at this time. If the law proved applicable to the Commission of Fine Arts, this charter would be official and the Commission would be in compliance. The Secretary also pointed out that all meetings of the Commission would have to be held in public session in the future and that executive sessions would no longer be permissible. Annual reports of the Commission activities would also be required, and that proper announcement of the agenda of the Commission would be required henceforth, under this law. The Secretary further stated that the Staff and the Chairman had taken all reasonable steps to comply with the law pending the outcome of the applicability question. The members were unanimous in their concurrence with this procedure.

EXHIBIT A

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS

A. General Services Administration and Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Federal Home Loan Bank Board Headquarters Building, 17th & G Streets, N.W. Persons attending the meeting for the discussion of this project design were as follows: Messers Harold Shore and William Tracy for the Home Loan Bank Board; Messers Ray Nixon and Wayne Kulig of the General Services Administration; Messers Martin Stein and George Wright of Max Urbahn Associates, Inc., the architects; Mr. David Smith of the National Capital Planning Commission; Mrs. Carol Bickley, Mrs. Leila Smith, and Mr. David Bonderman of Don't Tear It Down, Inc.

The Assistant Secretary presented a series of drawings showing the schematic designs for this building which had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts in April 1974. He also presented drawings which

showed a proposed modification of the approved design which retained 610 17th Street, N.W., the so-called Winder Annex. The proposed design retained and restored the Winder Building and the so-called Annex to its north, while providing an open slot entrance to a center-block courtyard between the Annex and a new and slightly smaller Home Loan Bank Board Building.

Statements were also made by Mr. David Smith, giving the actions of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Joint Committee on Landmarks; Mr. Ray Nixon, giving the position of the General Services Administration; Mr. Harry Shore, giving the position of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board; Mr. Martin Stein, giving the position of Max Urbahn & Associates; and Mrs. Carol Bickley, the President of Don't Tear It Down, Inc., a citizen's group which was party to litigation on the project.

EXHIBIT B, EXHIBIT C

After examining the drawings, listening to the various statements and general discussion, the Members voted unanimously to disapprove the design as presented. The primary reason for the disapproval of this design was the slot to the north of 610 17th Street, N.W., which gave the impression of a missing building the size of 610 17th, or the Annex. The Commission suggested that if this scheme of retaining the Annex was to be pursued, the slot should be filled in with a building and that the center-block courtyard could be reached through an arch or other device, which would not be disruptive to the cornice line and give the impression of a missing tooth. This gave the project sponsors the option of returning to the original scheme, restudying the modified scheme, or a total restudy, perhaps retaining the old Riggs Bank Building on the corner of 17th and G Streets, N.W.

EXHIBIT D

B. Smithsonian Institution, National Zoological Park

Preliminary Plans for Remodelling Elephant House Yards and Bird House Hill Development. The project was represented by Dr. Theodore Reed, Director of the Zoo, and Mr. Norman Melun, the Zoo staff architect. Mr. Avery Faulkner, the consultant architect, was also present.

The Secretary presented a series of drawings depicting these two projects which the Commission members had been previously sent and had been indicated on the Zoo master plan. The Bird House Hill landscape development consisted of a new sidewalk and exhibit arrangement outside the existing Bird House. The Secretary pointed out that the design of the walks proposed had been softened in accord with the Commission's previous suggestions. The Commission unanimously approved the revised designs for the Bird House Hill Development.

14 August, 1974

As the Secretary presented drawings for the Elephant House remodelling and relandscaping, he told of his site inspection with the Assistant Secretary on the previous day, August 13, 1974. He told the members that he and the Assistant Secretary had been alarmed at the number of large scale trees which were marked for removal in connection with this project and of the potential hazard to the wooded picturesque qualities of the Zoological Park. Dr. Reed and Mr. Faulkner convinced the members, however, that the expansion of the facility could be accomplished in no other way with the existing design and the existing building. The Commission unanimously approved the design for the exterior regrading, landscaping, and exhibit construction for the Elephant House.

EXHIBIT E

C. National Park Service, National Capital Parks

1. Fort Circle Parks, Shelters for Fort Totten, Fort Dupont, and Fort Stanton, Skating Pavillion for Fort Dupont, Preliminary Designs. The projects were represented by Mr. Leroy Rowell, of National Capital Parks, and Mr. Louis B. Fry, the consultant architect.

The Assistant Secretary briefly presented the scheme for a unified picnic shelter, sign, and furniture program for these parts of the Fort Circle Park System. He indicated that they were part of the Bicentennial Park effort and would be done in conjunction with community input as well as National Park Service efforts for 1976. Sub-areas within these parks were to be developed within the existing master plans.

Mr. Rowell introduced Mr. Fry, the architect, who made a presentation of his designs. The skating pavillion, comfort stations, and picnic shelters were all to have exposed aggregate concrete structural members with dark brown trim. The roofs of the shelters were to be bronze "Lexan" plastic. Mr. Fry also showed schemes for using a matching exposed aggregate concrete for light poles, drinking fountains, sign bases, and waste container bases.

The Commission unanimously disapproved the design for the picnic shelter suggesting that the columns be restudied as plain concrete cylinders and that the foor trusses be simplified. The outer surface of the roof trusses was covered with a wooden soffit in the proposal; the members suggested that the outer element be left open to expose the trusses. Mr. Roche questioned the wisdom of flat plastic sheets, because of puddeling and probable dirt staining. Restudy of these elements was recommended.

The Commission also unanimously disapproved the designs of the signs, fountains, trash recepticles, etc., saying that the exposed aggre-

gate concrete bases seemed too heavy. A simpler solution to these elements was recommended.

EXHIBIT F

2. Anacostia Park Master Plan. The project was represented by Mr. Leroy Rowell of the National Capital Parks, and Mr. Colden Florance, of Keyes Lethbridge and Condon, the consultant architects.

The Assistant Secretary presented a series of drawings showing the areas adjacent to the proposed skating pavillion which jad been recommended for restudy at the Commission's previous meeting. The Commission's specific objection had been a parking lot very close to the edge of the Anacostia River. Since this parking intruded on the waterfront walks and was unneccessarily visible from the other side of the river, the consultant had agreed to a restudy. The revised scheme showed this parking area moved to the rear of the skating pavillion and out of sight from the river. This scheme was unanimously approved by the Commission.

3. Anacostia Park Roller Skating Pavillion - Preliminary Design. The project was represented by Mr. Leroy Rowell of the National Capital Parks and Mr. Coldon Florance of Keyes, Lethbridge and Condon, the consultant architects.

The Assistant Secretary presented a series of drawings and a model depicting the large open-truss-roofed pavillion with small masonry utility areas within the corners of an overall roof. The members had seen a very schematic version of this structure before and after some general discussion, unanimously approved it.

EXHIBIT G

4. Bus Shelter for 7th Street, National Gallery of Art, West End - Preliminary Design. This item was removed from the agenda by mutual consent of the Chairman acting as Director of the National Gallery of Art and Mr. Rowell, acting on behalf of the National Park Service.

D. Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers

Army Band Building, Fort Myer - Preliminary Design. The project was represented by Messers Pete Zuyus and Dick Thomas of the Baltimore Corps of Engineers and Mr. Louis B. Fry, the consultant architect.

The Secretary presented drawings and a model of this specialized musical practice, performance, and instrument storage facility which was designed to conform to the Fort Myer Master Plan. He noted that a band shell facing the parade ground was an optional feature, depending on funds and that the shape of the proposed structure was very like a

group of linked theatrical spaces.

Mr. Fry, the architect, described the functions of the buildings including efforts to have its brick walls match adjacent buildings and the roof to have black pebbles to simulate the slate on nearby residential buildings. Since the building had a frank structural expression of its functions and blended with adjacent structures, while following the Master Plan, the Commission unanimously approved it.

EXHIBIT H

E. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

U.S. Customs Service Seal Medal, Proposed Design. No project representatives arrived for this project.

The Secretary presented drawings depicting the design for this medal. The Commission unanimously approved it.

EXHIBIT I

F. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development

1. SL 75-8, 25 Louisiana Avenue, N.W., New Nine Story Office Building for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, AFL-CIO. The project was represented by the architect, Vlastimil Koubek.

The Secretary presented drawings for this addition to an existing office building within sight of the Capitol and Union Station Plaza. The proposed addition was a separate building of very simple style designed to quietly harmonize with the older building.

Mr. Koubek explained that the new structure was to have white marble to match the old building, but where the older section had green and mirror glass, the new was to have bronze glass. The first two levels of the addition were to have parking and the upper seven floors were designated for offices.

The Commission unanimously approved the design.

G. Redevelopment Land Agency

1. Glasgow Seafood Restaurant and Store, Site 2-A of "C" Deck, Southwest Waterfront - Preliminary Design. The project was represented by Mr. Larry Press of RLA and Mr. R. M. Beard of the Glasgow firm.

The Assistant Secretary presented drawings showing the building in relation to the approved master plan for the Southwest Waterfront, pointing out that its architectural features and material color were con-

sistent with the palette previously approved for this area. He pointed out that there was a lack of resolution in a portion of an easement pedestrian-way through the site which was only partly covered. Mr. Press agreed that this question would be resolved by RLA review.

The Commission unanimously approved the project.

EXHIBIT J

LUNCHEON BREAK, from 1:30 to 2:15 p.m.

2. International Trade Center, Metro Center, 12th & G Streets, N.W. - Preliminary Design. Consideration of this project was held in Executive Session at the request of the Redevelopment Land Agency in view of sensitive private investment considerations for this project which was considered to be in the public good. The project was represented by Mr. Larry Press and Miss Jo-Ann Neuhaus of the Redevelopment Land Agency and Messers Henry Liu and Stanley Pinska represented the client, Tracen Corporation, and were the architects.

The Secretary presented drawings and a model to the members showing a large downtown commercial combined use project which covered frontage on three blocks of the G Street shopping area of Washington. He mentioned that one of the primary questions requiring the Commission's attention was the fact that the design used air rights by building over both 12th and 13th Streets, N.W.

Mr. Liu described his project design to the Commission stating that the desire was to have all elements of the project physically linked laterally along G Street, which was to be pedestrianized. He showed that the project was divided into commercial areas at or visible from the street, and to have a hotel midway and on the top, with offices between. Large banquet and exhibition spaces were to make the facility unique in downtown Washington. The design, though schematic, represented a well-executed variety of spaces and relationships to the existing streetscape, the historic church adjacent to it, and the intentions of a variety of city planning agencies. The one problem stated by Mr. Liu was his inability to obtain cooperation from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to upgrade their escalator service and provide adequate knock-out connection panels adjacent to the project. Since the projected daily population of the building was 56,000, this was expected to be a critical problem.

The Commission unanimously approved the preliminary scheme, saying that this was one of the most exciting proposals for downtown Washington they had seen. Mr. Roche called the design "brilliant", which summed up the Commission's reaction.

EXHIBIT K

14 August, 1974

H. D.C. Government, Department of Economic Development (cont'd.)

2. SL 75-7, 1724 Portal Drive, N.W., New Private Residence. No representatives for this project attended the meeting.

The Assistant Secretary presented drawings for this proposed contemporary-styled single-family house, also showing photographs of the wooded site across the street from Rock Creek Park.

The Commission unanimously approved the project, subject to satisfactory material selection.

3. Appendix 1, Shipstead-Luce Act, unanimously approved.

4. Appendix 2, Old Georgetown Act, unanimously approved.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 3:10 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARKOYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

9 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Ash:

In accordance with the requirements of P.L. 92-463, October 6, 1972, 86 Stat. 770, the Commission of Fine Arts submits its Advisory Committee Charter.

The following elements of the Charter are listed in the order in which they appear in section 9 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, subsection (c), (A) through (J).

(A) The official designation of the Committee is the Commission of Fine Arts.

(B) The Commission's primary objective is to ensure the beauty of Washington as the National Capital. It is also the objective of the Commission to render the best possible advice on all matters of art of a national nature, including monuments, memorials, medals, and other works.

(C) The Commission of Fine Arts was established by Congress May 17, 1910 as a continuing advisory agency.

(D) The Commission of Fine Arts reports to the President.

(E) The Commission of Fine Arts is an independent agency funded annually by Congress.

(F) The Commission advises Committees of Congress, the President, and heads of Federal executive agencies on matters of art; and the District of Columbia government on matters of public architecture

...2/

Exhibit A.

affecting the appearance of Washington. The Commission also advises the District of Columbia government under P.L. 231, 40 U.S.C. 212, 46 Stat. 366 on the design of private and semi-public buildings in certain areas of the National Capital, and under P.L. 808, 81st Congress, H.R. 7670, D.C. Code 5-801, 64 Stat. 903 on the design of private and semi-public buildings in the Old Georgetown area of the National Capital. Under P.L. 465, 36 U.S.C. 124, 60 Stat. 317, the Commission also approves the design of military memorials of the American Battle Monuments Commission. Also see Executive Orders 1259, 1862, and 3524.

(G) The current estimated annual operating cost is $174,000. The Commission has a full-time staff of seven.

(H) The Commission of Fine Arts meets monthly.

(I) The Commission has no termination date, being an advisory committee established by Congress under P.L. 181, 61st Congress, H.R. 19962, 40 U.S.C. 104, 36 Stat. 371.

(J) This charter is filed on August 9, 1974.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Roy Ash, Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C.

MR. ATHERTON: That should be our answer to this attorney, if he tries to stop the proceedings.

MR. GALLINGER: Look, we are trying to get a legal opinion on this and this is not essential right now.

MR. BROWN: It is a matter of grace. We are happy to have you in here.

MR. GALLINGER: On the comeback, you have deferred judgment on this matter pending a legal decisions, that is the simplest way.

MR. BROWN: All right, let us invite them back in because we really have been discussing the internal rules and regulations.

PUBLIC SESSION

MR. BROWN: Now, we get submissions and reviews of individual projects and we have round up our discussion of administration matters.

Mr. Myer, do you want to present Item A?

MR. MYER: Item A on the agenda is the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

We have been asked by the General Services Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to put this on our agenda this morning.

As you recall, the Commission considered this matter and approved this design for the project at its April,

1974 meeting.

Since that time, various studies have been performed by the applicants in this case.

They have submitted a revised scheme for the project.

This morning we have representatives from the General Services Administration, their architect, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building, the National Capital Planning Commission and a citizen's group by the name of Don't Tear It Down.

All of these people are prepared to make statements on the subject, for the Commission's consideration.

I would briefly describe what the differences are between the scheme which you approved and the scheme being presented today for your consideration.

The primary change presented to you is the additional element of retainingthe so-called Winder Building, an annex, which is the existing structure flanking to the north, the Winder Building.

As you might recall, this building was partly damaged during the demolition of several adjacent structures.

However, the facade and certain parts of the structure are still in decent structural shape.

The proposal would include retaining the Winder Building and restoring it.

Obviously the face of the building to the north, could not be restored because it would be partly a wall to the annex.

A part would be retained for government use, with the addition of a stairway and entrace to give it visual identity and it is definitely a different style from the Winder Building.

The annex is Italian. This would create some more diversity than the previous proposal, which included only the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building and the Winder Annex.

Obviously the Winder Annex necessitated decreasing the size of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Headquarters by this much.

The present proposal includes a diminished new headquarters building and most of the original features of the plan including the center court, the shops and commercial activities on the groundfloor and the offices above on the top floors of the new building.

Unless there are specific questions about what is before you, I would like to introduce Mr. Smith from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, who can fill you in on the action taken by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Joint Committee on Landmarks which advises the National Capital Planning Commission and

review this project with Mr. Smith.

MR. BROWN: Before we do that, can you explain again, your last point.

In order to take care of the program, they are adding, cubic space?

MR. MYER: I do not know that for a fact. I do not believe I said that.

Perhaps we could address that to the architect, Mr. --

MR. BROWN: There are no other changes?

MR. MYER: That is right.

MR. ROCHE: Could I get a clarification on the status of these programs as landmarks? There seems to be some confusion.

MR. MYER: The Winder Building is very definitely a landmark. There is no proposal to remove or in any way damage that in any way other than a full restoration to its original condition.

MR. BROWN: It has historic values; does it not? I think it was used during the Civil War?

It was the War Department during the Civil War.

MR. MYER: That is unquestioned and unchallenged. The Winder Annex Building has a difficult or questionable landmark status.

The Secretary of Interior,who is empowered to designate landmarks briefly, has said, or his office has indicated this structure is eligible to be on the National Register and therefore, is subject to procedures of the Historic Structures Act and so forth.

The Joint Committee on Landmarks has not designated how this procedure actually works and it is somewhat confused at the moment, but to basically say the Department of Interior considers the building eligible for the National Register does give it some protection.

The Landmarks Committee, who is the proper group to initiate such a designation, disagrees with this.

MR. ROCHE: What is the status of the Riggs Bank Building?

MR. MYER: The Riggs Bank Building has been a CategoryIII, of the Joint Committee on Landmarks for a number of years.

It has not been nominated to the National Register and is not on the National Register. Someone can correct me if I am wrong.

That building still exists with respect to its two street facade. It has been damaged substantially in the rear.

However, the facades are in place.

MR. SMITH: Upon reviewing the final site and building plans for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building on August 1 of this year, the Commission took two actions, one approval of the final building plans as shown in the exhibit to your right, for the building and the second action is to defer --

MR. MYER: Excuse me, Mr. Smith, the final site and building plans to the left.

MR. SMITH: They are to the right.

MR. MYER: They approved the scheme?

MR. SMITH: I said, upon reviewing the final site and building plans, the Commission took two separate actions.

One was approval of the final building plans, as shown in the middle exhibit there and secondly, deferral on action of the final site plan is shown to your right with the request that the General Services Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revise and resubmit that site plan as it reflects the demolition of the building at 610-17th Street, N.W. and a redesign of the 17th Street courtyard entry feature.

As part of the discussion that took place on the first of August, the Commission had before it the report of the Joint Committee on Landmarks which on July 23rd

of this year, took the following action.

At that time, the Joint Committee found, by retaining the structure at 610 17th Street, the final site and building plans for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Headquarters would adversely affect the Winder Building.

Therefore, they recommended the structure at 610 17th Street not be retained.

In addition, the Committee recommended a design be made in the structure of the facade of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building in order to create a open space between the building and the Winder Building approximately that shown in the previous submission of the development which was reviewed by the Committee itself on February 26, 1974.

MR. MYER: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

We have Mr. Nixon here from the General Services Administration. I believe he could introduce us to that agency's position and his consultant, Mr. Stein is here and also Mr. Shore, his legal counsel, for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Building.

MR. BROWN: Before he begins, let us consolidate so we are all clear on what has been said.

That determination by leaving the open space was made by the landmarks Committee?

MR. MYER: The Landmarks Committee and the Planning Commission, both, basically, recommended this scheme, which recommends the demolition of this building which is part of the scheme that is before you today.

MR. SMITH: The Commission, in turn, recommended the entry feature be redesigned.

The Joint Committee going further, and recommending the building be also part of this courtyard entry feature design and that the resultant design more approximate their earlier submission as shown to the left.

MS. BROWN: We have a representative of the NCPC here.

MR. MYER: That is the representative of the NCPC.

MS. BROWN: Do we have a representative of the Landmarks Committee?

MR. MYER: Mr. Smith has been kind enough to represent both.

MR. ROCHE: Could I ask a question as to why this group recommended the demolition of the annex?

Is there any elaboration on that recommendation?

MR. SMITH: You are referring to the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Landmarks?

MR. ROCHE: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Very quickly looking at the entire

report that was prepared at that time, it represented a series of actions dating from July 24 of 1973 to November 27, 1973, to January 29, 1974 to February 26, 1974, prior to the recommendation made on July 23, 1974.

There were a series of recommendations through that year's review period, but the recommendation on February 26 preceding this final report, the Committee found, at that time, the final site and building plans for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board Headquarters were compatible with the three adjacent National Register landmarks.

Specifically, that involved the Winder Building, the Old Executive Office Building and the Renwick Gallery, except with respect tothe proposed gates at the entrances to the courtyard from F and 17th Streets and subject to further review of the exterior treatment of the building for compatibility with the exterior restoration of the Winder Building.

At that time, materials had not been specified.

MR. BROWN: That gate is not the one we saw before.

MR. MYER: That is the most recent submission. The original was a round gate.

MR. BROWN: This is in response to that criticism?

MR. SMITH: That is right. That is an April submission. I am referring to a February submission.

Finally, the Joint Committee recommended the adverse impact of the proposed gates have been changed, and can be mitigated by one, their elimination, or redesigned to reduce their scale.

That drawing does reflect the earlier recommendation. Does that answer your question?

MR. ROCHE: I guess my question was their opinion rendered in any form of a report which is available in more detail as to why they made such a recommendation?

MR. MYER: We could obtain their staff report and their final report for the record and for your consideration.

Generally, the feeling was that the full freestanding restoration of the Winder Building which, according to the information we have, did have a facade on the part wall side and would be repaired by the retention of this building.

They also discussed the scale difficulties of having too large a building with one small relatively unrelated building.

MR. SMITH: The symmetry of the Winder Building was also discussed at that time.

The fact the addition would offset that, beyond that I do not have any additional information to supplement the remarks I made.

There is additional information to this that can be provided to you.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Mr. Nixon?

MR. NIXON: Thank you, Mr. Brown and members of the Commission.

I want to, first of all, thank you for your time. I know this is a project that has been previously before.

We regret there has been the necessity to ask your review again.

I might pointout this building is not typically a public building as described by the Public Building's Act and it is being built by GSA for the Home Loan Bank Board rather than its being a project which is initiated by GSA in a normal course under the law.

However, it does have the same legal requirements for review and approval of the various bodies here in the District.

I think in line with the question that was just raised, having set in on the Joint Committee's deliberations and recognizing the background, one of the considerations that has been throughout here and which influenced the Joint Committee's decision is the plan and the proposal for the restoration of the Winder Building to as close to its original state as we will be able to do which would be

impeded by the retention of the Winder Annex, which as Mr. Myer said, has not, until the recent consideration, come into the consideration for inclusion as a historic facility.

With that, I would like to introduce Mr. Shore, who is representing the Bank Board and for whom we are actually serving as a construction agent.

MR.ROCHE: Does the restoration of the Winder Building include the restoration of the facade, which I understand existed?

MR. NIXON: This is a part of our contract for the development of the Home Loan Bank Board Building.

I might mention also the architect who is doing the Home Loan Bank Board Building is also the architect for the exterior renovation of the Winder Building.

MR. BROWN: That means there would be fenestration punched through.

MR. NIXON: To the extent I would not make a commitment as to what the final results would be, but here again, this being a historic facility, it will require our coming back before the Commission.

You will be given a future opportunity to comment on the extent and the success with which we have been able to restore it, should this decision be the one that is reached.

MR. ROCHE: Is there material available to show what that facade looks like?

MR. NIXON: Unforunately, there are several of them and I guess that would be something I am sure the architect would be in a better position to address himself as to what is the proper point in time we would be looking to restore it to.

With that, I would like to ask Mr. Shore, from the Bank Board, to speak to you.

MR. SHORE: Will it be convenient if I stand here?

Good morning,Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. My name is Harold Shore. I am Assistant General Counsel for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

My purpose is to explain, briefly, the background of the Board's decision to revise its original design plans for its new headquarters building to retain the building at 610 17th Street, the so-called Winder Building Annex and the reasons underlying the Board's decision.

Incidentally, a question on that point was just brought up.

It was my understanding, and I am sure GSA will back up this position, that GSA and the Bank Board have a united position here in favor of retention of the Winder Building Annex and Mr. Nixon's remarks, which he addressed to

the Commission, were a summary of the NCPC's decision and GSA is not in any sense advocating any position before this Commission which is inconsistent with any postion with the Bank Board respecting the aspect of the design of the building or the part of the plans of the building on the site.

MR. NIXON: Yes, I hope that is understood.

MR. ROCHE: I did not understand that.

MR. BROWN: I did not either.

MR. SHORE: I am trying to clarify GSA's position. GSA and the Bank Board both favor retention of the Winder Building Annex.

Mr. Nixon, a few mintues ago, mentioned a few reasons which might be construed demolition of the annex.

He was not representing the NCPC's position, rather than advocating a position on behalf of GSA.

As the Commission will probably recall, litigation interrupted construction on the Bank Building in March and thereafter, the Board of the General Services Administration began negotiations in order to meet an amicable settlement with the plaintiffs.

The Board, in order to avoid protracted court proceedings and because it was impressed with the sincerity and good faith of the plaintiffs, decided to take

a fresh look at its building plans to see if the remaining buildings on the site, particularly the Riggs Bank Building and the 610-17th Street building could be saved.

In order to study the plan further, the Board and GSA retained the firm of Hartman and Cox, which presented various studies in connection with both of those buildings.

The Board decided the Hartman and Cox studies for saving the Riggs Bank Building were not entirely satisfactory, but it was impressed with the notion that the 610 17th Street building should be retained.

The reasons for it are first a retention of the building, the Board feels would bring certain a variety to the block because it would mean a fairly small building would be juxtaposed with two larger ones.

That is the Winder Building and the Bank Board's new building.

Second, the Board has been informed the building is structurally sound and it believes that the unbalancing effect, for the reason we just mentioned, for the NCPC's decision to vote for demolition of the Annex, the Board felt that very unbalancing effect added a certain interest and charm to that block.

Also the Board believes the building could be made attractive. It lends a certain flavor of old Washington and finally we were impressed with Don't Tear Down's and Mr.

Hartman's position that older buildings of interest should not be demolished unless there were compelling reasons for do so.

In the case of Riggs, the Board felt there were such compelling reasons because the design studies which involved retention of the Riggs Bank, simply present to many other problems.

I would like to discuss one of these other problems. In effect, I will be anticipating a statement which will be made by Carol Bickley from Don't Tear It Down.

One of the studies the Board considered back this past June involved the design submitted by the Urbahn firm which involves a complete new concept for the Board's building.

The Urbahn study consists of three futuristic, modernistic, triangular towers which would rise on G Street, adjacent to the Riggs Bank, and which would retain the Riggs Bank.

The reason for this new study, we feel, is that the Riggs Bank, while small in size, is large and monumental scaled, and only a very strong building, making a very strong statement of its own, could exist next to Riggs and set it off while at the same time making its statement.

Unfortunately, the Board felt any building

sufficiently strong to complement the Riggs Bank would be an unduly obtrusive neighbor and would overshadow the Winder Building and compete for attention to a significant extent with the Executive Office Building across 17th Street.

In other words, the Board felt the new Urbahn study, while not unattractive itself, was simply not the right building for that particular site, in that particular location.

That is all I have, ladies and gentlemen.

MR. ROCHE: Was the Board's action directed at the design of the new building or the idea of putting it there?

This is the one where the Riggs Bank Building would be retained, and the new building would be placed behind it, in these three triangular buildings which I have not seen, except as reproduced in the newspapers.

Was the Board's action, in turn, that was the action directed against the specific design of that building or against the idea?

MR. SHORE: There was a specific design submitted by Urbahn, although the Urbahn firm did not represent that as necessarily the final design, there would undoubtedly have been opportunities for modification of the particular design should the Board decide to adopt that design.

It was a concept of final design submitted to the Board with detailed sketches, slides and so on.

MR. ROCHE: They simply did not preclude the possibility of doingthat scheme in another design?

MR. SHORE: I am not sure I understand the thrust of your question.

MR. MYER: Mr. Shore, he is referring to the triangular elements as beingsuitable or not suitable for the use of the Board.

MR. STEIN: The assumption that was made in that concept was how to get all of the buildings, the Riggs Bank, the Winder Building Annex, all comfortably on that rather tight site.

Would not you consider the demands of the program;to do that, we exceeded the height limitation.

We went from the 90 foot height restriction to 130 feet with the presumption that perhaps the saving of the Riggs Bank would allows us to get a variance to exceed the height limitation.

I believe this was the fatal flaw so to speak, as the designer felt apprehensive about exceeding the height limitation in the first place.

I felt it was worth considering if we could achieve the solving of everyone's problems, the retention of the Riggs Bank, the retaining of the open space.

However, in retrospect, and I have had plenty of time for retrospect, I feel exceeding the height limitation and going up to 130 feet, when the Winder building is only 72 feet high, would have an adverse effect on that building and I believe of the various reasons the Bank Board decided not to accept that design, this was one of the major reasons, exceeding the height limitation.

MR. ROCHE: Would you say it would be impossible to design a building back there and not exceed 130 feet and at the same time fulfill the program and retain the Riggs Bank Building and the Winder Annex?

MR. STEIN: It is not impossible. Going back to the beginning of the project, we submitted various alternative schemes to retain the buildings on 17th street and it was the opinion of the various reviewing agencies, the mass of the building, we would have to occupy the whole site practically.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in being pushed back from 17th Street and losing 30 percent of the site, it would become indeed a monolith.

We would not be able to achieve the open spaces which were inherent in the objectives of designing a courtyard space, a shopping area,et cetera.

That would not be impossible to achieve, but very difficult to achieve.

In other words, we could get, but it was the consensus that it was not a good idea, if that answers your question.

MR. NIXON: If I might repeat what Mr. Shore has said in reiterating GSA's position in this project, we are the agent for the Bank Board and of course, we are interested in furthering whatever they are interested in, providing we are in conformance with all of the requirements which are necessary for a project to be built by GSA.

I also have the privilege of sitting as the GSA representative on the National Capital Planning Commission, so the historical data I was giving you was what was presented to us by the Commission.

Mr. Stein has already addressed you on this one point. Do you have anything further?

MR. STEIN: No.

MR. NIXON: We would be happy at this point to answer any questions you have.

That is the completon of our presentation.

MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

MR. MYER: Mr. Chairman, we have representatives from Don't Tear It Down, the President, Mrs. Carol Bickley, is here and with her, Mrs. Leila Smith and Mr. David Bonderman.

Ms. Bickley has prepared a written statement which you have before you.

Perhaps you wouldcare to either paraphrase it, read it or add to it.

Ms. Bickley. Good morning. My name is Carol Bickley.

I am President of Don't Tear it Down, Inc., a citizens action group working to protect and enhance Washington's physical environment.

For those of you who are not from Washington and may not be familiar with Don't Tear It Down, we are a group of citizens who are concerned about the district's rapidly changing physical environment.

We have addressed ourselves to this problem to try to influence what happens.

We volunteer our time and expertise and have worked long and hard on a number of issues -- our first being the preservation and use of the Old Post Office.

Today, three years later, we are concentrating our immediate efforts on trying to salvage a part of the cityscape, to paraphrase Wolf VonEckardt, so that historic ambience is not thrown out the window.

Because you may not be familiar with the litigation surrounding the question of design of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, I would like to take a minute of your time and

explain how we arrived at the current state of affairs.

The history of this project is quite long and complicated. On March 2nd and 3rd, depending upon whose version you believe, at any rate over a weekend, the General Services Administration, acting as agents for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board started demolition of the historic structures along 17th Street between F and G Streets, about two blocks from here, in apparent violation of the law.

As a result of this action, Don't Tear It Down filed a law suit which resulted in a temporary restraining order halting further work on the 17th Street facade of the site and thereby halting further demolition of the remaining structures.

One of the two buildings still standing is the Riggs Bank Building, a local landmark designated by the Joint Committee on Landmarks, of which the Commission on Fine Arts is a sponsor, and declared eligible by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

The other remaining structure was the Winder Annex, which the Secretary of the Interior declared to be an integral part of the Winder Building and therefore listed on the National Register.

There has been -uch made of the fact that the Joint Committee did not declare the Annex a landmark and that therefore it is not.

This is patently absurd. The Joint Committee is charged administratively with carrying out the mandate of the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act.

The ultimate authority rests in the Department of the Interior with the National Register of Historic Places.

This determination is extremely significant and must be taken into consideration during all deliberations.

We would liketo support Mr. Shore's statement. There has been a quite a bit of discussion about how the Annex will fit in with the restoration, of the Winder Building, but there has been no definitive statement of what the Winder Building will look like after it is restored.

It has been noted in the past, the Winder Building at one time was stucko and the annex was bricks, so there could be a lot of diversity if it could be restored as a stucko building.

We think actually the Winder Building is not noted for its architectural significance.

It is noted for its historical significance. Events of the past which give it landmark status has an architectural unit, we think it is enhanced by the sympathetic addition of the Winder Annex.

The Winder Annex is, in a way, identical, different

sizes, patterns. It is an architectural unit, an example of how an addition can be made to a block and to a building.

We think it is extremely significant. It was pointed out to us that should the Winder Building, which was originally built as an executive office building, if it were built in Georgetown today, it would be described as Coca-Cola Georgian.

Another thing I would like to point out is that even subsequent to demolition, it was determined in Mr. Hartman's study that both the Riggs Bank and the Winder Building were structurally sound and it would be economically feasible to restore it.

There has been discussion this morning about the alternative of three triangular buildings.

We would like to note that this block is rather of a design that says something special about Washington.

We find it hard to imagine that would have any overpowering effect on the Old Executive Office Building, with its exuberance and wonderful style.

We think the whole area of Pennsylvania Avenue is becoming more and more routine, drab and lacking in diversity.

Unfortunately we feel the Home Loan Bank Board is going to add to that. We have worked closely with the Bank Board and we are pleased they have chosen to save

the annex and we wish they had chosen to save the Riggs Bank too.

We hope future design considerations will take this into account, the things that could be done that could be very special for a block of this nature.

We would like to encourage you to save the Winder Annex. We think it will add to the character of this block.

Thank you.

MR. ROCHE: Are you recommending only preservaton of the Winder Annex?

You are not talking about the Riggs Bank?

MS. BICKLEY: Our agreement with the Federal Home Bank Board is we will not take any positions that will cause delay of their project.

We entered into a good faith agreement;as a result of their looking again at that project, we would not cause any further delays;in the cause of law suit that means we will not oppose further construction of the building.

We will continue, in our judgment, that what GSA did was illegal, but we will not continue to cause delay.

The Bank Board has stated it will take six more months to perfect drawings on the bulding we really thing is superior

That would, in effect, be a delay and contraint.

MR. WEYMOUTH: The building you feel is superior, did that include the Riggs Bank?

MS. BICKLEY: Yes, it does.

MR. MYER: This has not been presented to the Commission.

MS. BICKLEY: The only public exhibition of the building has been the Wolf VonEckardt article which has been attached to our testimony, drawing number five.

Mr. VonEckardt noted the beauty of that design. He pointed out there were some window ornamentation which is a little cluttered but it would add to this area and enhance this area.

MR. ATHERTON: The design number five does include Winder Annex, but not the Riggs Bank.

MS. BICKLEY: If we had to chose between one or the other, I think we would chose the Riggs Bank.

It is an anchor on that block. It is a significantly interesting building and would provide enough diversity on the block.

However, under the circumstances, we feel the Winder Annex is second best.

MR. ROCHE: I am not sure if you are the person to answer this, but have studies been made to retain the Riggs Building and taking the space of the Winder Annex?

MR. BROWN: Not for architectural purposes, just for open space.

MS. BICKLEY: Mr. Hartman presented a number of alternatives in his study.

He was permitted to consider that alternative to remove the Winder Annex and save the Riggs Bank Building and suggest a design of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

He felt retaining all of the units on the block was an important part of the design, so his suggestions were always to retain the annex.

It was strictly a question of style, but he felt retain the Winder Building, the Winder Annex and the Riggs Bank would add more diversity to the block.

MR. ROCHE: Scheme Five does not retain the Winder Annex.

MR. STEIN: Each of the schemes, two, three, four and five, have both options. You could say that it is two and 2(a), four and 4(a), five and 5(a).

The (a) was always that the Winder Annex could be saved in each of those.

Mark, could you identify the source of the schemes or the schemes that were designed by Urbahn Associates?

MR. STEIN: Numbers two, three and four were

developed by Hartman and Cox.

Number five was developed by my office.

MR. WEYMOUTH: And five is the one that goes above the height limitation?

MS. BICKLEY: It is not higher than the buildings across the street. It goes about 90 for that one.

MR. STEIN: I am sorry, I met it exceeds the 90 foot height limitation. It goes up to 130 feet, which is the limitation on the block to the north.

MR. MYER: The Mills building which is this.

MR. ROCHE: Why was not a scheme, the scheme four or scheme three more preferable to this -- scheme in the sense that it retains the Riggs Building which certainly has more character superficial or not to the Winder Building?

It also provides a home loan building that is also much lower in height.

Why let us tear it down or let us not tear it down?

I like to go with the present scheme.

MS. BICKLEY: We are not making a choice of buildings. The arrangement was the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would, in good faith, review all of the close alternatives and make their decision and talk to us about it.

They did so. Being assured they had reviewed them all carefully and in good faith, we dropped our delaying part of the suit.

MR. NIXON: If I may point out here, this is not necessarily the first instance in which an alternative design was considered which would have included retention of the Riggs Bank.

In the alternatives that were originally developed for GSA and the bank, I believe there were four, would have presented to you, ifnot formally here, in the circulation of the environmental statement, which I believe the Commission is a recipient of.

It did contain the four alternatives, the design alternatives, which Urbahn had proposed which included the retention of the Riggs Bank.

There was a narrative explanation in the environmental statement as to why that was rejected.

I would say it is not a unique consideration, but it was a consideration that was made.

I honestly do not know whether a consideration was included for the retention of the Winder Annex, but I believe it did include the Winder Annex and in fact, all of the facade along 17th Street, if I am not mistaken.

MR. SHORE: Although Riggs Bank was small in size and the studies we saw, prepared by Hartman and Cox, which included retention of the Riggs Building

along with the Bank Board Building which the Board wanted to be a modest, quiet self-effacing building that those two buildings, side by side, when they existed side by side, as we saw them, neither building complemented the other, but both buildings, in effect, swallowed each other up and left that block looking bland and blah.

The Board felt in order to put up a building next to the Riggs Bank, which would both complement the Riggs Bank and allow the Board's new building to make its own statement and have its own identity, there would be the necessity to construct a very strong building which was very different from what the Board had in mind.

The Board wants its own building to be a modest self-effacing building and to permit the strongest building to be the courtyard.

MR. ROCHE: I have to disagree with that.

It seems to me it has nothing to do with the scale of the Winder -- the scale of the Riggs Building has nothing to do with how the Home Loan Building would come out.

It seems to me you can hardly make a building which is a stronger scale than the present proposal has anyway.

MR. BROWN: Not to mention the whole facade on G. Street.

MR. SHORE: I am summarizing the Board's position for you.

MS. BROWN: In none of the schemes, have we ever heard any discussion of the possibility of the Home Loan Bank Board closing the gap and being contiguous to the annex.

It is a combination of these two schemes, but you retain the annex and you build the Home Loan Bank Board right up next to it and you get a total facade.

Is that a possibility?

MR. SHORE: I think that is something the Board would oppose pretty strongly on the grounds that the open space here is necessary to invite the public into the courtyard.

The Board is very strong about maintaining the public plaza and the shopping center here as a way of giving some life to that block during the day and after dark.

If you close the facade, the public plaza will be not inviting to the public. It will be almost deserted.

We want to invite people in, even people not familiar with that area.

The other problem of retaining the Riggs Bank which I should have mentioned is that it is

contemplated the corner of the Board Building will be transparent and will again serve to invite people into the courtyard, whereas, the Bank Building which is opaque, will block off the courtyard and will have a deterrent effect rather than an inviting effect.

MS. BROWN: I wonder if you have ever been in St. Francis Square in San Francisco and seen the street offof it where a retail store, designed by Frank Lloyd Wright proves a principle of architecture.

You almost have to experience it to believe it.

What he has done with this building, which was the germ of the idea of the Guggenheim Museum, so that shoppers are invited up to see all of the merchandise, but the facade of the building is a brick wall.

As you come of the very fenestrated facade of St. Francis Square, you come out to the side street and all you have is a brick wall, like a warehouse wall and the effect on the pedestrian is fantastic.

As you go by this, you keep looking for something in this wall which will be an 6pening. Then you get to it and it is in the form of an arch which is bissected in the middle, one-half is glass which operates as a show window and the other is an entrance.

In general American architecture, in a city where one's idea is to put everything out in class, all of a

sudden to have this solid wall of brick is a fantastic change of pace, but when you get to that entrance, it is almost physically impossible not to go in.

It is like a huge vacuum that just sucks you right in. It is has been a huge commercial success.

You defy someone to walk pass that entrance and not be sucked into it.

Another option they might be willing to consider is if you could make enough of a feature about an annoucement ofall of the amenity inside, which we have commended the Home Loan Bank Board for up to this point, so that you can see under and feel the vacuum pump pulling you and the secret garden behind the excitement of going in there, you would be able to maintain the corners height all of the way and maintain the facade plain all of the way, except for the opening underneath and then you are talking about cityscape architecture.

You are getting into what Paris has where you have whole blocks of great character and the buildings are of different periods, but they conform to an overall look of the city.

This possibly is a way of balancing an enormous mass of asleticism of the -- it will be across the street and at the same time, integrating the annex into the cityscape of architecture without putting too much emphasis

on one building or having the negative effect of the annex, which is interesting, perhaps, to throw the Winder Building off bounds, but in my view, not if the next thing to it is air on the other side.

Once you have a solid plane, you have the Winder Building providing a real function, which is variety without any of its minuses which is to unbalance and challenge the symmetry of the existing building.

You have two styles at war there, one is a very retardier Georgian style and it was built probably to look like a drawing on the left to be freestanding and have breadth and air around it and to operate in that way.

Then with its addition, you have broken into a Victorian asthetic where you are after asymmetry and you have a very different kind of city architecture which is meant to take its place in a row of facades.

That becomes sort of a mega building which is subdivided into a variety.

Certainly one option, I have not had a chance to discuss it with other members of the Commission because we have not discussed this before today, but one option would be to continue the facade plan and it seems to me what is presented now is the typical compromise solution.

It is the worst of all worlds that could be

presented and it does not have the dignity of the former school's scheme of the two buildings which have light around them and set off with air and space.

The values such as they are, of the old Winder Building, nor does it become a cityscape block in which you have variety in the values of the annex and it has some nostalgia about it, even though it has no architectural significance.

However, what we end up with is a gaping tooth here like a nine year old kid who got into a fight on the baseball lot and he comes in and this is what you see when he smiles.

However, this is not indicative of the National Capital. You have struck a blow at the Winder Building's central thing which has to be symmetrical.

It seems to me you follow immediately into the worst of all possible worlds.

MR. WEYMOUTH: Let me clarify one point. Is the Riggs Building out? Is that a mote question? There is not other redesigner reconsideration of trying to retain it as of number four or three?

Is it a fait accompli; it is togo?

MR. SHORE: I do not know if fait accompli is the right words. The Board has voted it must go and the NCPC.

The design before the Commission today inherently involves demolition of the Riggs Bank and do not tear it down as stated.

Today, they are formally opposing demolition of the Riggs Bank, although they would like to see it, needless to say we will be guided by the judgment of the Commission.

It is a question of whether it is a fait accompli.

MR. ROCHE: We have never had the opportunity to review that possibility.

MR. BROWN: It has never been presented to us as an option.

MRS. SMITH: The design, we seem to get more unhappy as we get more compromise.

In the future, I do not know how this will end because of the constant remodeling of the base design where you had some rules for a site, where you knew what you were doing.

Then you say keep three buildings, keep one, keep two and it becomes a constant -- the original design is lost.

In the future what must be done, there must be some way the ground rules, before you design a building, are fixed.

The fact that you are constantly considering remodeling, there should be some way there is a fixed place,

the street, this is the place, this is to be retained or not retained.

I think the whole thing is suffering badly from this constant shift, change in the nature of architecture.

You never quite throw out the original concept, so no one to this living moment, as far as I understand it, knows what the site is until now and you cannot design a building that is constantly be stretched or chopped off and so on.

It is no longer a whole design. That is what concerns me most. It is a harmful process to be going through.

MR. BROWN: I agree with you 100 percent. This Commission has not had a chance to review these various options.

I think given the status quo now with the various parties willing to concede the demolition of the Riggs Bank Building to reintroduce that, unless we are presented with something that we know in our bones is going to be done, is going to be counterproductive.

I agree it is a better building than the Annex and it is a question of historical perspective to say that collectoris is any less valid than any other style in the city.

On the other hand, it is going -- I think one plus,

one can encourage oneself with and that is we are developing a street which has a specific set of demands on it given mainly by the cornice height that is vigorously established across the street, by the EOB.

The problem with nostalgia is that you get different periods at war with each other.

At a certain point, it is ridiculous to retain a building built to another scale of another period in juxtaposition with buildings since built.

Obviously there are extreme examples in New York. I am thinking at the moment where this guy held out, a skyscraper had to be build around him and he is a cute little 1860 building of three stories and a 40 story skyscraper next to it.

I am sure it is a nice idea to keep a building because it was built in 1860, but it does not do the city of New York any good just sitting there like a wart.

You have to realize we are creating things which have to be preserved in the future and each generation should have the opportunity of moving the whole thing ahead.

My view of moving you ahead is trying to get the interest of the city paramount and broaden our focus on something that really works rather than narrowing

our vision too much on this building, that building, what age it is and so on.

I think there can be a case made for tearing anything down if what goes in its place is a net plus.

The antiquity of the building is not by itself, its total justification. If you carry that to its logical conclusion, the City of Washington would still be a swamp because that where was there before or it would still be as it was in 1930, without some of the buildings that have been built since.

You cannot take the argument to its conclusion that antiquity in and of itself, is an overriding plus.

Rome has this problem all of the time. If they want to cut a street through, tearing down buildings, you are constantly having to make these value decisions.

Are you going to keep a church? Are you going to tear it down or keep it because there is the ancient ruin underneath.

In my own line, I can resign myself to tearing down this Riggs Bank Building, although I have the greatest possible affection for it, but I would love to see it integrated in the city, however it does not integrate into 17th Street when you think of the Red Cross Building, the Pan American Union, coming up to the Corcoran, carrying right up to those buildings on the other side of the street, the EOB, the Corcoran Gallery, the

Warneke Building and so forth, we are talking in very large units.

Let us face it, our government needs space. This is the Capital, we need offices and I think it can be justified, so what we are really talking about is what makes 17th Street best.

In my view, it can be argued. The Riggs Building can go if we put something in its place which is going to make 17th Street okay.

My own judgment is that we have to discuss this with members of the Commission,that our original decision on this, which at least had the encouragement that the cornice height would be established and if you get a cornice height established in that block, and can get a solution which either maintains the other side all of the way through and therefore,keeps the variety or the solution we had previously where we have at least historic values of one building be enhances, that you are okay.

One thing is unacceptable and that is this compromise solution.

Kevin, what are your thoughts?

MR. ROCHE: I agree with that. Certainly the final objective is to create a decent street. However, the scheme, as it was originally presented to us, indicated

both the Riggs Bank Building and the Windor Building were not landmarks and had no social or historical value which apparently we find now they do have.

You are either serious about both of them or neither, so in a sense, I concur with your decision.

Either we take both of them down, because I do not see the Windor Building Annex in any more significant, in any way, than the Riggs Bank Building, and there could very well be a scheme whereby we would retain both of them.

I would retain that, pursuing that and also closing in an making a full street, certainly making a gash in the middle of the street is not inviting.

To cite another example, Munich is full of six, seven story buildings with openings into courts.

MR. BROWN: In addition to the advantages urbanisticly in maintaining a cornice height and cornice line and facade are the advantages we can learn from Europe of opening up space within.

That to me, has always been the great plus of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board idea which is a great amenity and I think their desire to make a very pleasant interior space, there is a great plus and they should be commended for it.

Part of what works and has been an idea since the

ancient Greeks and was beautifully carried out in ancient Rome, the Plaza Struzzia, for example.

Go out to the -- and they have a center interior. That has not been the traditional American tradition with people building little lots back and so forth, I think it is in the future.

I would like to see that done here, but it is not going to be achieved if the scheme is going to be able to look out with a great vast like that, and then a blank wall with nothing on it.

MR. WEYMOUTH: It was an important statement made by Mr. Hickey. I think it is important also in the City of Washington and if all things -- if the Bank Building could be retained and a really exciting building in Washington can be there and if they are willing to do it, if there should be a solution, I think that is the best of all possible worlds.

When you start cutting away, pushing and pulling, all you get is mediocrity.

MR. BRADY: How do have a full agenda. I think what we have before us is this scheme. If there is a motion to reject this motion as such, and entertain other proposals, this is the way we might go.

The other proposals could be either a scheme which could maintain a solid facade and perhaps have an

inviting entrance and interior court or a scheme which would retain the Riggs Bank and come up with a very amazing building behind it.

I have my doubts that will be going to be that practical. That the difficulties of the challenge, but it seems to me, is up to the people who have submitted this to make their own decisions.

All we can do is, as an advisory commission here, to advise on specific plans that have been submitted to us.

My own vote would be against it.

MR. ROCHE: Are we voting now?

MR. BROWN: I think we can.

MS. SMITH: I am against it.

MR. ROCHE: I am against it.

MR. ATHERTON: It will be unanimously against the proposal.

We have a problem here. I understand the Gun't Tear it Down group wants to stay and I think pending a declaration of offers of management and budget, we have a perfect right to proceed in opposition.

We have been advised by an attorney we are within our rights to do so.

Do you want to go on then to the next subject?

MR. BROWN: Yes, the Zoo.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

30 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Roush:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed, at its meeting on August 14, 1974, the most recently proposed scheme for the erection of a new office building at 17th and G Streets, N.W. for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. Key to the proposed design was the retention of 610 17th Street, known as the Winder Annex, and the provision of an open entranceway to the internal courtyard between the Annex and the new bank building to the north on G Street, on the site of the Riggs Bank Building.

The Commission rejected the design. We felt that it neither achieved any significant results in preserving the historic ambience of the street, nor did it contribute at all to the urban design of the block. By leaving the smaller Annex as proposed, and an open gap right next to it of almost the same dimension, there was the distinct impression something was missing. It struck us as a compromise solution, disruptive to the continuity of the street facade, and that almost any other approach would be an improvement.

We would be happy to review any alternative proposal. These might include any of the following options:

1/ Restore the Winder Building as a free-standing landmark as it was originally conceived and executed, before its later appendage. The symmetrical facade of this Georgian-style building would then function as one of two dominant free-standing elements on this block of 17th Street, with special attention to the opening of the interior court so as not to create a gash in the street facade. This is essentially the scheme that was approved by the Commission on April 17, 1974.

...2/

Exhibit D.

2/ Retain the Annex to the Winder Building, if there are compelling reasons to do so, but eliminate the open gap to the interior courtyard, and complete the 17th Street facade of the new bank building as a continuous element from the Annex to the corner of G Street. The Annex would hopefully be restored in a different color from the Winder Building so as not to spoil the symmetry of the earlier building, and would be joined by a new vertical element beside it so that it would read as part of a variegated street facade. Access to the interior courtyard would be through a portal which, we believe, would make the interior space particularly inviting to the passer-by.

This scheme has the advantage of maintaining a uniform height; maintaining an uninterrupted facade plane so as to reinforce the feeling of a city street; and providing an excellent foil through its relative neutrality to the Old Executive Office Building across the street. This is perhaps the most sophisticated of the solutions, at least from the point of view of the design of the city as a whole.

A third possibility was also discussed: retaining the Riggs Bank Building and coming up with a scheme integrating it into the new construction in a solution of the highest architectural distinction. The Commission felt that such a solution might be possible, but concedes it would be very difficult to achieve.

We will be meeting again on September 18, 1974, and next on October 16, and will be happy to view any further developments.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Larry Roush, Commissioner
Public Buildings Service
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C. 20405

Copy to: Harold Shore, FHLBB

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO — CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
JANE O. DART — EDWARD STONE, JR.
KEVIN ROCHE — GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

26 August, 1974

Dear Dr. Reed:

We were glad to have the opportunity at our meeting on August 14, 1974 to hear from you directly on some of our questions about the remodeling of the Zoo.

It is too bad that a way can't be found to save more of the existing trees around the Elephant House Yards, but your practical answers to our queries were persuasive if not exactly good news. Luckily the eating habits of elephants and giraffes are confined to those particular species and similar circumstances will not crop up elsewhere in devising new plans for other animal displays.

The plans for Bird House Hill are greatly improved. The new paths now have the same feeling of movement and circulation associated with the rest of the system - a certain flow that is relaxed and informal and entirely suitable as an established rythym to follow in all cases.

Both the Bird House Hill project and the Elephant House Yards are approved.

Concrete samples for the Lion Hill project were inspected by the staff on the evening before our meeting. It was their feeling, and the Commission concurs on this, that the random width board formwork should be used in conjunction with the concrete slightly tinted with a warm buff color. Every opportunity should be taken to stay away from the stark gray of raw, untreated concrete.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Dr. Theodore Reed, Director
National Zoological Park
Washington, D.C. 20009

Exhibit E.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO — CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
JANE O. DART — EDWARD STONE, JR.
KEVIN ROCHE — GEORGE WEYMOUTH
CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

30 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Stanton:

I am writing to confirm actions taken by the Commission of Fine Arts at its meeting on August 14, 1974 regarding preliminary designs for new park shelters at Fort Totten, Fort Dupont, and Fort Stanton. Plans were also presented for other street-furniture elements including lighting fixtures, drinking fountains, and park benches.

We felt the designs were generally too heavy in appearance. The roof structures for the shelters seemed to be too complex for what should be essentially a light and informal pavillion. The exposed concrete aggregate columns with their tapered profile also appeared unduly heavy. This same criticism applies to the street lighting and signs. While we do not suggest a duplication in design, the small shelters approved at our same meeting for the Anacostia Park were more successful, with their simple frame construction and use of materials.

Our next meeting is scheduled for September 18, 1974, and we will be happy to view further studies at that time.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard L. Stanton
Acting Director
National Capital Parks
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

Exhibit F.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

26 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Stanton:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on August 14, 1974, reviewed plans for the development of Anacostia Park, including new picnic shelters, rest room facilities, and a major new structure for roller skating.

We were delighted to see the way these plans have been developed since we last saw them. The elimination of the parking along the river's edge is a great improvement, and the new structures, with their palette of natural materials, will nicely complement the rich landscaping that is capable of growing along the Anacostia River.

All of the designs were approved as presented.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard L. Stanton
Acting Director
National Capital Parks
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

30 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Stanton:

As part of the Park Service's Bicentennial Plan for the Fort Circle Park System, the Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on August 14, 1974, reviewed plans for a new skating rink to be constructed in Fort Dupont Park.

I am happy to report that the Commission approved the design. Our one concern, however, is the relationship of the parking lot to the principal view from the rink. As you well know, the panorama of Washington from Fort Dupont is nothing short of spectacular. It would be a shame for any major new structure such as the skating rink not to take full advantage of this view. We would hope that the plans can be revised to depress the parking in order to provide the maximum amount of visibility of the city as seen from the skating rink.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Richard L. Stanton
Acting Director
National Capital Parks
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

Exhibit G.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

30 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Schletzer:

At its meeting on August 14, 1974, the Commission of Fine Arts reviewed preliminary designs for the new Army Band Building at Fort Myer, Virginia.

The plans were approved with the provision that the brick match that of the adjacent buildings.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. C. L. Schletzer
Chief, Engineering Division
Baltimore District, Corps of Engineers
Department of the Army
Post Office Box 1715
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

Exhibit H.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

30 August, 1974

Dear Mrs. Brooks:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on August 14, 1974, reviewed designs for the U.S. Customs Service Seal Medal based on the historic Customs House in Galveston, Texas.

The design was unanimously approved.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Hon. Mary Brooks, Director
Bureau of the Mint
Department of the Treasury
15th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

Exhibit I.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5324

30 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Mister:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on August 14, 1974, reviewed preliminary designs for the Glasgow Seafood Restaurant on Site 2-A of "C" Deck, on the Southwest Waterfront.

The design was approved with the provision that the projecting entrance canopy be carried across the entire north facade, in order to tie in with the eventual adjacent construction. It is also our understanding that the brick and standing-seam metal roof will match the color of Hogate's Restaurant immediately to the north.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
Redevelopment Land Agency
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit J.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

NICOLAS ARROYO
JANE O. DART
KEVIN ROCHE
CHLOETHIEL WOODARD SMITH
EDWARD STONE, JR.
GEORGE WEYMOUTH

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-343-5524

26 August, 1974

Dear Mr. Mister:

We were happy to have the opportunity of viewing the preliminary drawings for the International Trade Center at 12th and G Streets, N.W. at our meeting on August 14, 1974.

The designs were both impressive and exciting, qualities which are desperately needed if downtown Washington is ever to be revitalized. The large-scale interior spaces for circulation and commercial activities adjoining the proposed pedestrian mall on G Street will make an exceptional contribution in this regard. For this reason in particular, every effort should be made to retain these features in the face of the inevitable financial pressures that accompany such a project to maximize rentable floor areas. Without these special spaces, the quality of the entire undertaking could lapse into the category of another Merchandise Mart, and would be unacceptable for the center of this Capital City.

The proposed concept of bridging the north-south streets is an acceptable one, depending on how it is done. There are no important vistas in either direction that would suffer unduly, and the view along G Street, which is important, would actually be strengthened.

The approach to the architectural character of the complex is also good. Neutral and straightforward, with emphasis on the horizontal expression and a fairly typical palette of Washington materials, i.e. light colored masonry, the proposed design has considerable merit. The architect is entirely right that this is no place for architectural gymnastics.

...2/

Exhibit K

We are greatly in sympathy with the need to tie the Metro stations into the proposed structure on a much greater scale. It would seem self-evident that if the Washington subway is to be a success, it is just this sort of project that should be encouraged by tying in the mass transportation system to the greatest extent possible.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Melvin A. Mister
Executive Director
Redevelopment Land Agency
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
SL 74-72	2501 M Street, N.W. Savage Fogarty Company	Six story office building.

ACTION: Approved as preliminary design. Request submission of working drawings for review prior to issuance of permit. Also request sight line drawings showing penthouse profile as seen from Rock Creek Park. 6/14/74

73	1735 F Street, N.W. YMCA	One story building, walls are CMU painted, built-up roofing on flat roof, no windows.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Exterior finish of concrete block not recommended. Suggest 7' high garden wall at building facade line of historic Michler Row and some landscaping. Parking on site is not requested by application and not recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts. 6/14/74

74	129 C Street, N.W. Mark Hatfield	Add two-story rear addition with bay, deck, and fence; new front retaining wall and front basement windows.

ACTION: Issue permit. 6/26/74

75	643 Indiana Avenue, N.W. District of Columbia	Rental of public space for sidewalk cafe.

ACTION: Issue permit. 6/26/74

76	3800 Linnean Avenue, N.W. Hungarian People's Republic	Construct an Embassy/Chancery for the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic.

ACTION: Approved as preliminary design. Request submission of working drawings and sample of exterior material prior to issuance of permit. Recommend mature landscaping for this scenic and historic site. 6/14/74

77	600 22nd Street, N.W. George Washington University	Erect new Physical Education Building (resubmission refer to SL 74-15).

ACTION: Approved provided cooling tower on northwest corner of building not exceed 5' in height above cornice and be painted to match main penthouse. Or, as alternative, relocate tower, incorporating it within main penthouse area. 6/7/74

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	*ADDRESS AND OWNER*	*PROJECT*
SL 74-		
78	*1345 E Street, N.W.* *The Fatted Calf*	*Canvas awning.*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 6/26/74*	
79	*509 14th Street, N.W.* *George Zeitleman*	*Special decoration for the Committee to Elect Walter Washington.*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. Exception to SL Act based on temporary duration, fact that sign is decorative rather than textual, does not obliterate architectural features, and is not a detriment to the architectural quality of this building. 6/13/74*	
80	*4805 Colorado Avenue, N.W.* *Vermelle H. Turner*	*Fence from side of house and inclose rear of property, new fence 5' high to coincide with swimming pool requirements (pool may be planned later).*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. No objection because fence will have very little visibility from public space. 6/26/74*	
SL 75-		
1	*739 15th Street, N.W.* *Golden Brothers*	*3' x 15' plastic sign: Golden Brothers Tailors.*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 7/24/74*	
2	*2301 Calvert Street, N.W.* *Indian Curry House*	*Wood sign perpendicular to Calvert Street (resubmission refer to SL 74-71).*
ACTION:	*Returned because of insufficient information. Please resubmit, showing exact location of proposed sign. 8/13/74*	
4	*1735 F Street, N.W.* *YMCA*	*One story masonry building (resubmission refer to SL 74-73).*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 7/22/74*	
5	*7326 16th Street, N.W.* *Mr. A. L. Demond*	*Enclose existing side porch.*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 8/2/74*	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 74-139	1661 34th Street, N.W. Mrs. Vera Dickey	Close in existing first floor open porch at rear. Build roof overhang 2'0" and brick finish deck with stairs.
ACTION:	Issue permit for drawings as marked. 6/26/74	
140	3278 M Street, N.W. NJG Corporation	10' single-faced sign flat against building.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 6/26/74	
141	3056 M Street, N.W. Cafe de Paris	Canvas awning over doors and windows.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 6/26/74	
142	3239 M Street, N.W. Georgetowne Beef Company	Canvas awning over door and window.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Relationship between sign, doorway pediment, and windows not resolved. Having awning cut off part of door pediment not recommended. 6/26/74	
143	3306 Prospect Street, N.W. John B. Howerton	Construct fence 27' long on owner's side of party line to run alongside existing picket fence and attached at one end to party wall. Fence to resemble existing fence on opposite side and rear of property.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Question height of fence from grade in owner's yard. Question visibility from public space. 6/26/74	
144	3239 Q Street, N.W. Lucia Warren	Second floor addition over existing first floor.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 6/26/74	
145	3330 Reservoir Road, N.W. Dr. Javier Sagarminaga	Construct new accessory building and new swimming pool in rear of property.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Insufficient information on exact appearance of proposed structure with respect to brick arch and opening treatment and cornice (area where roof meets wall). Material sample should be submitted prior to construction. 6/26/74	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 74-146	1417 33rd Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. David Schwartz	Convert existing basement to garage.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Proposed curb cut, drive, and garage opening would have an adverse impact on this particular building as well as the streetscape of this block. 6/26/74	
147	3108 Q Street, N.W. Donald Jeffries	Install in-ground gunite swimming pool.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 6/26/74	
148	3238 R Street, N.W. Reid A. Dunn	Construct two new dwellings.
ACTION:	Not recommended. Proposed subdivision of block and new construction of two dwellings impairs historic and architectural values of existing property. Alternate plans for the preservation of this historic property should be explored. 7/19/74	
149	3412 Prospect Street, N.W. Jeanne Beekhius	Enlarge basement window to match width of upper story windows as per recommendation of Fine Arts.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 6/26/74	
150	3231 P Street, N.W. Brentano's Books	Three signs as per photographs.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Photos inadequate for judgement. Locations of signs not clear from submission. Recommend site plan showing exact proposed locations. 6/26/74	
151	3143 N Street, N.W. United Nations Gift Shop	One sign projecting out from building line.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Additional sign not recommended for this building. 6/26/74	
152	1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. Georgetown Inland, Inc.	Install two 4' x 6' wood painted pictorial construction site signs.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 7/10/74	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	*ADDRESS AND OWNER*	*PROJECT*
OG 74-153	*1742 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.* *Atlantis Sound*	*New wood and metal sign.*
ACTION:	*Do not issue permit. Recommend maximum dimensions of 2' x 6' with classical-style letters. Also recommend removal of words "HiFi" and "Stereo" from sign text. 7/10/74*	
OG 75-1	*3239 M Street, N.W.* *Georgetowne Beef Company*	*Canvas canopy over windows only (resubmission refer to OG 74-142).*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. Recommend awning material be buff and light brown - no bright yellow. 7/10/74*	
2	*1209 31st Street, N.W.* *Booked Up*	*Canvas awning over window.*
ACTION:	*Returned for clearer photographs of existing building. 7/10/74*	
3	*1804 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.* *Perennial Shop*	*Canvas canopy over door. Carriage lamps to be outside of awning.*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 7/10/74*	
4	*3306 Prospect Street, N.W.* *John B. Howerton* *Resubmission refer to OG 74-143*	*Construction of fence 7' high from grade and 27' long on owner's side of party line to resemble existing fence on opposite side and rear of property.*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 7/10/74*	
5	*1249 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.* *Charles Rendelman*	*Erect 2' x 12' single-faced sign with necessary changes to meet regulations (resubmission refer to OG 74-100).*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 7/10/74*	
6	*1249-A Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.* *Charles Rendelman*	*Erect single-faced 45" x 32" sign with necessary changes to meet regulations (resubmission refer to OG 74-99).*
ACTION:	*Issue permit. 7/10/74*	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 75-7	3214 P Street, N.W. Britches Western	Non-illuminated painted sign.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 7/24/74	
8	1641 Avon Place, N.W. Jean M Jacques	Extend existing rear balcony 7'7" and change stairway to circular stair.
ACTION:	Issue permit. New circular stairway and balcony railings shall be simple, non-ornamental iron. 7/24/74	
9	3403 M Street, N.W. Louis J. Calomaris	Install new sign.
ACTION:	Issue permit. 8/9/74	
10	1434 36th Street, N.W. Mr. D. Johnston	Cover front and rear clapboard walls with ALCOA aluminum siding. Cover window trim and sills and front facia and overhang.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Information on exact proposal not adequate. Details of flashed window trim and side joints must be shown. Show exact relation of new siding to cornice and all existing trim. New siding must be in plane with adjacent, matching row and of same shape and width. Suggest repair or replacement of wood as a considered alternative. 8/9/74	
12	1218 31st Street, N.W. John Snyder	Installation of exterior sign.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Proposal not recommended because of excessive size, fancy shape, and ornate ironwork. Suggest simpler, rectangular sign no larger than 24" x 24". Bracket should be simple iron bar; suggest centering it over door. No objection to projection or type face. 8/9/74	
13	3231 P Street, N.W. Brentano's	Three signs (resubmission refer to OG 74-150).
ACTION:	Issue permit for one sign only facing Wisconsin Avenue and one sign only facing P Street. Existing signs are to be removed. 8/9/74	

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN ON THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

14 August, 1974

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
OG 75-14	3143 N Street, N.W. United Nations Gift Shop	One double-faced sign projecting 12" from building (resubmission refer to OG 74-151).
ACTION:	Issue permit. Old signs shall be removed prior to installation of new sign. 8/9/74	
15	1365 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Peter Consanti	One sign above flower stand facing wall.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Proposed sign location not recommended. 8/9/74	
16	1737 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Robert C. Thomas & Sandra L. Ragan	Erect sign on doorway leading to second floor. Letters to run vertically up right side.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Vertical text not recommended. No objection to horizontal composition with same type face. 8/9/74	
17	3614 Prospect Street, N.W. Northmont Homes, Inc.	Construction of pool and deck addition to rear of existing structure.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Question concept of this great a projection aesthetically at this particularly visible location. Recommend against combining contemporary, "New Orleans", and pseudo-Colonial architectural styles in this case. Board will consider revised scheme, but adequate photographs, elevations, and plans should show proposal in relation to adjacent row of housing and view from Key Bridge as well as M Street. 8/9/74	
18	1639 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Jagdish Katyal	One 6' x 2' sign.
ACTION:	Do not issue permit. Design including figure not recommended for this location. 8/9/74	